

REMARKS

Claims 11-22 are pending in this application, of which claims 11, 14, 19 and 20 have been amended and claim 22 is newly-added.

Claims 11-13, 17, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Huang et al.** (previously applied) in view of **Chang** (previously applied).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

First of all, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's assertions appearing in the second and third lines in the second paragraph of Section 2 in Page 2 of the Office Action are not correct. The interlevel dielectric layer 24 is not provided between substrate 10 and conductive stripes 20A and 20B, but rather on conductive stripes 20A and 20B. Therefore, interlevel dielectric layer 24 does not correspond to insulation layer 2 of the present invention. Please refer to Fig. 5 and the description in column 4, lines 35-47 of **Huang et al.**

Applicants also respectfully disagree with the Examiner's urging that stripes 20A and 20B in **Huang et al.** correspond to a ground plate, because they are clearly cited as strips and are provide with electrical signals. **Huang et al.** fails to disclose that the stripes 20A and 20B are supplied with ground voltage.

The Examiner seems to suggest that a fuse window 84 in **Huang et al.** corresponds to the groove in the present invention, notwithstanding the recitation that the groove is provided adjacent to and surrounding the pad. Such a window for a fuse as in **Huang et al.** is usually formed in a rectangular shape and does not "surround" any pad. Examples can be seen in Fig. 2

of Chen (USP 5,538,924) or Figs. 4a and 5a in Fukuhara (USP 5,618,750), where both Chen and Fukuhara are cited in Huang et al.

Claim 11 has been amended to clarify that “the groove is formed to bend along a corresponding one of said pads”, which is not taught, mentioned or suggested in either Huang et al. or Chang.

It should be noted that both cited references were discussed in detail in the responses filed September 17, 2003 and August 5, 2004. In these responses, it was argued that neither of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggests that each of the line conductors forms a micro-strip line in conjunction with the ground plate, as recited in claim 11.

In addition, the combination of the cited references teaches, at most, only one pad 72 on the most upper one of the interlayer insulation films, while the present invention has a plurality of pads arranged in series on the most upper one of the interlayer insulation films, adjacent to and along the periphery of the semiconductor substrate.

In each of Figs. 3, 5 and 6, only one pad 6 is shown adjacent to the periphery of a semiconductor substrate, where the semiconductor substrate is partially shown only in the area defined by a pair of meandering lines and adjacent to a straight line representing the periphery of the semiconductor substrate.

This depiction is used only for simplicity and it should be understood that the same pads exist in the area on the semiconductor substrate, which is not shown in the figures, as the pad shown in the figures. In fact, in Fig. 7, a plurality of pads are arranged along the periphery of semiconductor substrate 100, which depicts the entire area thereof, as would be obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art. Claims 11 and 19 recite this distinction.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Huang et al. in view of Chang, and further in view of Moritz (previously applied).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner has cited Moritz for teaching that the insulating film is made of polyamide or benzocyclobutene, but, like the other cited references, fails to teach, mention or suggest the limitations recited in claim 11, from which claim 18 depends.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

The claims are now in condition for re-examination.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

William L. Brooks

William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla

Atty. Docket No. 020129

Suite 1000

1725 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE